.1

claims, that is, using the determined coding efficiency to select a coding method for the part of the audio signal to be coded.

The principal concept of Applicant's invention is to enable the coding of any signal with best possible quality by selecting the order of pitch predictor to be used according to the signal. The selection of the pitch predictor order at the encoder needs to be transmitted to the decoder for the decoder to be able to decode the signal correctly. That is, the decoder needs to select the same pitch predictor order for decoding as was used for encoding. Therefore, the transmitted signal must carry this information from the encoder to the decoder.

As was submitted in the previous response, Matsumoto discloses a method and apparatus for coding a speech signal. Matsumoto discloses that the input speech signal is first split into two parts, a low-frequency and a high-frequency part, and each of these parts is then coded by using a pitch predictor. Matsumoto further discloses using a different pitch predictor on the different parts (bands) so that the predictor is best suited to the band to be encoded.

Applicant respectfully submits that Matsumoto fails to teach selecting the coding method (e.g., the pitch predictor order) so that the signal can be coded most efficiently, and therefore Matsumoto fails to teach the Applicant's claimed invention. More specifically, Matsumoto fails to determine the coding efficiency of the predicted signals, whereby it is impossible for Matsumoto to select the coding method based on the coding efficiency of the predicted signals.

Applicant wishes to call the Examiner's attention to the fact that in Matsumoto, the pitch predictor order is fixed, or at least there is no teaching that it could be variable. For this reason, Matsumoto can not, and does not, produce a set of predicted signals using a set of pitch predictor orders. This is a central element in Applicant's invention as claimed which Matsumoto completely fails to teach or suggest. Consequently, Matsumoto cannot use the set of predicted signals to determine the coding efficiently and to select the pitch predictor order to be used.

The Examiner refers to the voiced/unvoiced decision made by Matsumoto as the determination of coding efficiency. The applicant respectfully submits that this has nothing to do with determining coding efficiency. The V/UV decision is made purely based on the original signal, not the coded signal, and this decision merely affects how correctly or accurately the signal is coded. Matsumoto only uses the V/UV information to select between an LPC+sinusoidal coder and a CELP coder, and does not use any information of a coding efficiency to make the selection.

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Matsumoto does not anticipate claims 1, 21, and 27.

Claims 2-20, 22-26, and 28-39 depend from claims 1, 21, or 27 and are also not anticipated by Matsumoto.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should

any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gamberdell,

Reg. No. 44,695

March 11, 2003

Perman & Green, LLP 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06824 (203) 259-1800 Customer No.: 2512

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to 703/872-9314 the date indicated below, addressed to the Box AF, Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date: 3/11/03

Signature: W.